

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
AIKEN DIVISION**

Darrell Allen Findley,

Plaintiff,

v.

South Carolina, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. 1:25-cv-2769-RMG

ORDER

Before the Court is the Report and Recommendation (R&R) of the Magistrate Judge (Dkt. No. 20) recommending that the Court summarily dismiss this action without leave to amend or service of process because Plaintiff has failed to follow court orders to bring the complaint into proper form, failed to comply with Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 8 and 10, submitted frivolous claims, and failed to state a claim upon which relief could be granted. The Magistrate Judge further recommends that the Court deny Plaintiff's motions for writs of mandamus and habeas corpus. Plaintiff filed no objections to the R&R.

I. Legal Standard

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility for making a final determination remains with this Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270-71 (1976). The Court is charged with making a *de novo* determination only of those portions of the Report to which specific objections are made, and the Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In the absence of specific objections, the Court reviews the matter only for clear error. *See Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that

“in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’”) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee's note).

II. Discussion

Plaintiff, a pretrial detainee at the Pickens County Detention Center acting pro se, has filed suit against dozens of defendants, making wild claims without evidentiary support, such as that he was the target of a hit man and was subjected to satanic rituals and “sex parades” every day at the jail. (Dkt. No. 20 at 4-5). The Magistrate Judge summarized the widely varied and sensational claims of Plaintiff in his amended complaint and concluded that they were frivolous and failed to state a claim upon which relief could be granted. The Magistrate Judge was also unable to persuade Plaintiff to bring his complaint into proper form or to comply with the pleading rules of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The Magistrate Judge recommended that the Court summarily dismiss the amended complaint without service of process or leave to amend and further to deny Plaintiff's petitions for a writ of mandamus and writ of habeas corpus.

The Court finds that the Magistrate Judge ably summarized the factual and legal issues involved in the R&R and correctly concluded that Plaintiff's suit should be summarily dismissed without service of process or leave to amend. The Court further finds that the Magistrate Judge correctly concluded that Plaintiff's petitions for writ of mandamus and writ of habeas corpus should be denied.

III. Conclusion

In light of the foregoing, the R&R is **ADOPTED** as the Order of the Court (Dkt. No. 20), Plaintiff's action is **DISMISSED** without service of process or leave to amend, and Plaintiff's petitions for writs of habeas corpus and mandamus are **DENIED**.

AND IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Richard Mark Gergel

Richard Mark Gergel
United States District Judge

July 8, 2025
Charleston, South Carolina